

REMARKS

This response places this application in form for allowance, and therefore, is a proper response pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.116.

New claim 109 is added. Claim 84 is canceled. Claims 83, 86 and 88 are amended. The amendments to claims 86 and 88 more positively express limitations which were previously inherent in such claims, and accordingly, are not for the purpose of narrowing and do not effectively narrow the scope of claims 86 and 88.

Claims 1, 4-14, 56-70, 72-82, 90-98 and 104 are allowed.

Claims 83, 86-89, 99, 101, 102, and 105 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schuele (US 576047) in view of Ramakrishnan (US 5192871). Claim 100 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schuele/Ramakrishnan in view of Wu. Claims 103 and 106-108 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schuele/Ramakrishnan in view of Venkatraman (US 6093966), Chen (US 6100137) and Yu (US 6274443).

Claims 84 and 85 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten to include the limitations of the base claim.

Independent claim 83 is amended to include the limitations of objected to dependent claim 84, and therefore, as amended, independent claim 83 is allowable.


Claims 85-89, 99-103 and 105-108 depend from allowable independent claim 83, and therefore, claims 85-89, 99-103 and 105-108 are allowable.

New claim 109 includes the limitations of independent claim 83 (before the amendment of this response) and limitations of objected to dependent claim 85. Accordingly, new claim 109 is allowable.

This application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance, and action to that end is requested. If the Examiner's next anticipated action is to be anything other than a Notice of Allowance, the undersigned respectfully requests a telephone interview prior to issuance of any such subsequent action.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 8-19-05

By: 
D. Brent Kenady
Reg. No. 40,045